

**THE OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF
DIRECT TESTIMONY & EXHIBIT
OF
BRIAN HORII
MARCH 23, 2018**



DOCKET NO. 2018-2-E

**Annual Review of Base Rates for Fuel Costs for South
Carolina Electric & Gas Company**

1 **DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT**

2 **OF**

3 **BRIAN HORII**

4 **ON BEHALF OF**

5 **THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF**

6 **DOCKET NO. 2018-2-E**

7 **IN RE: ANNUAL REVIEW OF BASE RATES FOR FUEL COSTS FOR**

8 **SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY**

9

10 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.**

11 **A.** My name is Brian Horii. My business address is 101 Montgomery Street, San
12 Francisco, California 94104. I am a Senior Partner with Energy and Environmental
13 Economics, Inc. (“E3”) and have been retained by the South Carolina Office of Regulatory
14 Staff (“ORS”) to assist in the analysis of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company’s
15 (“SCE&G” or “Company”) avoided capacity cost and avoided energy cost calculations,
16 and review the Value of NEM methodology, in this Docket.

17 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.**

18 **A.** I have thirty (30) years of experience in the energy industry. My areas of expertise
19 include avoided costs, utility ratemaking, cost-effectiveness evaluations, transmission and
20 distribution planning, and distributed energy resources. Prior to joining E3 as a partner in
21 1993, I was a researcher in Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (“PG&E”) Research &
22 Development department, and was a supervisor of electric rate design and revenue
23 allocation. I have testified before commissions in California, British Columbia, and

1 Vermont, and have prepared testimonies and avoided cost studies for utilities in New York,
2 New Jersey, Texas, Missouri, Wisconsin, Indiana, Alaska, Canada and China.

3 I received both a Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degree in Civil
4 Engineering and Resource Planning from Stanford University. My full curricula vita is
5 provided as Exhibit BKH-1.

6 **Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE
7 COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA (“COMMISSION”)?**

8 **A.** Yes, I testified before this Commission on behalf of ORS in reviewing SCE&G’s
9 avoided cost calculations.

10 **Q. WHY WERE YOU RETAINED BY ORS IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

11 **A.** ORS retained E3 to once again assist in reviewing SCE&G’s avoided cost
12 calculations to:

13 1) Verify the Company is using the avoided cost methodology approved by the
14 Commission;

15 2) Confirm the methodology meets the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of
16 1978 (“PURPA”) requirements; and

17 3) Verify the avoided cost rates requested by SCE&G in this Docket are a
18 reasonable result of the approved avoided cost methodology.

19 ORS also retained E3 to conduct an analysis of the SCE&G’s Value of Distributed Energy
20 Resource (“DER”) calculation to:

21 1) Verify the Company has populated each of the eleven (11) categories according
22 to the methodology established in Order No. 2015-194;

- 1 2) Confirm, for each category with a value of zero, that the Company does not
2 have sufficient capability to accurately quantify those costs or benefits to the
3 utility system; and
4 3) Verify, for each category with a value other than zero, that the value assigned
5 is a reasonable result of the Company's ability to accurately quantify the costs
6 or benefits to the utility system.

7 My prior work experience in this subject matter includes the following:

- 8 • Developed the methodology for calculating avoided costs used by the
9 California Public Utilities Commission for evaluation of Distributed Energy
10 Resources since 2004;
- 11 • Developed the methodology for calculating avoided costs used by the
12 California Energy Commission for evaluation of building energy programs;
- 13 • Authored avoided cost studies for BC Hydro, Wisconsin Electric Power
14 Company, and PSI Energy;
- 15 • Provided review of, and corrections to, PG&E avoided cost models used in their
16 general electric rate case;
- 17 • Developed the integrated planning model used by Con Edison and Orange and
18 Rockland Utilities to determine least cost DER supply plans for their network
19 systems;
- 20 • Developed the hourly generation dispatch model used by El Paso Electric
21 Company to evaluate the marginal cost impacts of their off-system sales and
22 purchases;

- 1 • Produced publicly vetted tools used in California for the evaluation of energy
2 efficiency programs, distributed generation, demand response, and storage
3 programs;
4 • Analyzed the cost impacts of electricity generation market restructuring in
5 Alaska, Canada, and China; and
6 • Developed the “Public Tool” used by California stakeholders to evaluate Net
7 Energy Metering program revisions in California.

8 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE REQUIREMENTS OF PURPA AND HOW
9 THEY RELATE TO THE PR-1 AND PR-2 RATE SCHEDULES PROPOSED BY
10 THE COMPANY.**

11 **A.** In 1978, as part of the National Energy Act, Congress passed PURPA which was
12 designed, among other things, to encourage conservation of electric energy, increase
13 efficiency in use of facilities and resources by utilities, and produce more equitable retail
14 rates for electric consumers.

15 To help accomplish PURPA goals, a special class of generating facilities called
16 Qualifying Facilities (“QFs”) was established. QFs receive special rate and regulatory
17 treatments, including the ability to sell capacity and energy to electric utilities. All electric
18 utilities, regardless of ownership structure, must purchase energy and/or capacity from,
19 interconnect to, and sell back-up power to a QF. This obligation is waived if the QF has
20 non-discriminatory access to competitive wholesale energy and long-term capacity
21 markets.

22 In SCE&G’s service territory, Small Power Producers and Cogenerators that are
23 designated as QFs and have capacity less than or equal to 100 kilowatts (“kW”) are

1 compensated under SCE&G's Rate PR-1. Power purchased from QFs with capacity greater
2 than 100 kW and less than or equal to 80 megawatts ("MW") is compensated under
3 SCE&G's Rate PR-2

4 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE METHODOLOGY SCE&G USED IN THIS FILING TO
5 CALCULATE ITS AVOIDED ENERGY AND AVOIDED CAPACITY COSTS.**

6 **A.** SCE&G calculates avoided energy costs using the avoided cost methodology
7 known as the Differential Revenue Requirement ("DRR"). This method calculates the
8 revenue requirements associated with two (2) resource plan scenarios: a base case without
9 the QF, and a change case with the QF. This methodological framework is one of the
10 accepted methods for calculating PURPA avoided costs.

11 For the long-run avoided energy cost calculations, in both the base case and the
12 change case, SCE&G uses PROSYM, a production cost model, to simulate the
13 commitment of generating units to serve load on an hourly basis over a 15-year Integrated
14 Resource Plan ("IRP") planning horizon. The base case is constructed by using load
15 forecasts and supply side resources as described in the IRP. The change case modifies the
16 base case load forecast by subtracting zero-cost energy following the profile of a 100 MW
17 solar photovoltaic ("PV") generator. Finally, the avoided energy costs are leveled and
18 adjusted for taxes and working capital.

19 SCE&G has not provided a calculation for long-run avoided capacity costs.

20 **Q. IS THE METHOD USED BY SCE&G TO CALCULATE AVOIDED ENERGY
21 COSTS CONSISTENT WITH THE METHODOLOGY APPROVED BY THE
22 COMMISSION?**

1 **A.** Yes. The DRR methodology, as approved by the Commission in Order No. 2016-
2 297, supports various input models. In Docket Nos. 2016-2-E and 2017-2-E, SCE&G
3 calculated avoided energy costs by using the DRR approach modeling a QF with a constant
4 100 MW generation profile for the change case. In this Docket, SCE&G applies the DRR
5 approach modeling a QF with a solar profile for the change case. The shift of input models
6 for the change case from a constant profile to solar PV profile is a valid application of the
7 DRR methodology for the specific case of a solar generator.

8 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY SHIFTING TO A SOLAR PROFILE IS AN
9 IMPROVEMENT OVER THE PRIOR METHOD.**

10 **A.** Previously a constant generator profile was used to calculate the difference in
11 revenue requirements between the base case and the change case, with costs collected into
12 four (4) time of use (“TOU”) periods comprised of peak season and off-peak season, and
13 peak hours and off-peak hours within each season. The profile essentially assumed constant
14 solar output over the TOU period. Under the updated methodology, SCE&G derives a
15 change case by using a 100 MW solar profile. Given SCE&G's assertion that the vast
16 majority of recent and future QF resources are solar, it is an improvement to use an avoided
17 energy cost which more closely tracks the avoided energy for solar generation.

18 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE ANY OTHER UPDATES MADE BY SCE&G TO THE
19 AVOIDED ENERGY COSTS.**

20 **A.** In addition to the change as described above, changes in avoided energy costs are
21 driven by differences in fuel forecasts, load forecast, and in supply side resources as
22 reported in the 2018 IRP. In the 2017 IRP, SCE&G projected supply purchases from new
23 nuclear plants in 2020 and 2021. In the 2018 IRP, the construction of these nuclear plants

1 was canceled, with the capacity shortfall made up by increased solar and baseload
2 combined-cycle gas plants. This change in supply side resources likely had a small effect
3 on avoided energy cost calculation because the avoided energy cost is dependent on cost
4 for marginal units, and both nuclear and combined-cycle gas plants are listed as baseload
5 resources in the SCE&G IRP. I have reviewed the fuel price forecasts which SCE&G used
6 in calculating the avoided energy cost for both the 2017 and 2018 fuel adjustment
7 proceedings. These fuel price forecasts are consistent and similar. Finally, there is a slight
8 change in long-term annual sales growth (from 1.2% territorial sales growth annually to
9 1.1%) (SCE&G 2018 IRP). There appears to be no major changes in network
10 configurations or import/export assumptions used by SCE&G.

11 **Q. ARE THE UPDATES IN AVOIDED ENERGY COSTS A REASONABLE AND
12 CONSISTENT RESULT OF THE METHODOLOGY USED BY SCE&G?**

13 **A.** Yes. SCE&G applied the approved DRR methodology to calculate avoided energy
14 costs. SCE&G presents avoided energy costs calculated using a solar profile, as well as
15 avoided energy costs calculated using a constant 100 MW profile (Lynch, p. 11). Given
16 the relative similarity in fuel forecasts and minor changes in load, it is reasonable that the
17 avoided energy costs using the constant 100 MW do not change significantly from last
18 year. Furthermore, as SCE&G is proposing to set these avoided energy rates for solar
19 resources, it is reasonable to use a solar specific profile in calculating the avoided energy
20 costs. I agree with SCE&G's assertion that a solar generation profile can cause operational
21 and ramping issues which a constant profile does not cause. Thus, it is reasonable that the
22 avoided cost for energy using a solar profile is lower than the avoided cost for energy using
23 a constant energy profile.

1 **Q. IN YOUR OPINION, IS THE METHOD USED BY SCE&G TO CALCULATE**
2 **AVOIDED ENERGY COSTS APPROPRIATE?**

3 **A.** Yes, it is appropriate for solar generators.

4 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UPDATES MADE BY SCE&G TO THE AVOIDED**
5 **CAPACITY COSTS.**

6 **A.** SCE&G has implemented a dramatic change in approach by not providing any
7 avoided capacity cost calculations in this proceeding.

8 **Q. WHAT ARE SCE&G'S STATED REASONS FOR NOT PROVIDING ANY**
9 **CALCULATIONS OF AVOIDED CAPACITY COST?**

10 **A.** Company witness Lynch asserts that new solar projects would not provide any
11 capacity reductions, so the avoided capacity value for the PR-2 rate is de-facto zero. He
12 further states that SCE&G will not offer the PR-2 rate to non-solar resources, so there is
13 no reason to provide an avoided capacity cost estimate in this proceeding. Further, when
14 ORS requested SCE&G to provide a calculation of avoided capacity costs for potential
15 non-solar resources, SCE&G did not provide any estimate, stating that it had no
16 information responsive to the request.

17 **Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH SCE&G THAT NEW SOLAR PROJECTS WILL**
18 **PROVIDE NO CAPACITY VALUE?**

19 **A.** No.

20 **Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR YOUR DISAGREEMENT WITH SCE&G ON THE**
21 **CONTRIBUTION OF SOLAR TOWARD REDUCING CAPACITY COSTS?**

22 **A.** SCE&G asserts that "SCE&G needs as much capacity in the winter as it does in the
23 summer" (Lynch, p. 15) and "[b]ecause solar does not provide capacity during the winter

1 period, the Company is unable to avoid any of its projected future capacity.” (Lynch pp15-
2 16). SCE&G, however, has not adequately demonstrated that winter capacity needs are
3 the same or greater than summer capacity needs. If SCE&G capacity needs are instead
4 driven by the summer season, as SCE&G has historically stated (e.g.: SCE&G 2017 IRP
5 pp. 37-38), then incremental solar would continue to provide capacity benefits, and
6 incremental solar should therefore continue to receive avoided capacity cost compensation
7 in the PR-1 and PR-2 rate.

8 **Q. WHAT INFORMATION HAS SCE&G PROVIDED TO SUPPORT SCE&G BEING
9 CONSTRAINED BY WINTER CAPACITY?**

10 **A.** SCE&G states that “Since SCE&G’s Reserve Margin Study shows that SCE&G
11 needs as much capacity in the winter as it does in the summer, a resource has to provide
12 capacity in the winter as well as the summer in order to avoid the need for capacity and
13 thereby have capacity value.” (Lynch, p. 15). The reserve margin study states that SCE&G
14 requires 50% more capacity reserves in the winter as compared to the summer (21% vs
15 14% reserve margin). Referring to the SCE&G forecast of summer and winter loads and
16 resources from their 2018 IRP in Exhibit JML-1, one sees that, in many years, the winter
17 reserve margin target of 21% would be violated before the summer reserve margin target
18 of 14%.

19 **Q. GIVEN THAT INFORMATION, WHAT ARE YOUR CONCERNS WITH
20 SCE&G’S POSITION OF ZERO AVOIDED COST FOR INCREMENTAL
21 SOLAR?**

22 **A.** SCE&G has not provided a straightforward update to its avoided capacity cost
23 estimates in this Docket. Rather than simply updating inputs used to estimate the avoided

1 capacity cost, SCE&G introduced a new concept of 100% winter capacity constraints as
2 the basis for not calculating any avoided capacity cost. I have concerns that parties have
3 not had adequate opportunity to evaluate the accuracy of this winter capacity constraint.
4 In addition, the flaws and inconsistencies in SCE&G's 2017 Reserve Margin study make
5 this process even more difficult. For example, only through conversations with SCE&G
6 witnesses was I informed of the differences in the data SCE&G used to derive their
7 regression models of seasonal weather response. This data was not provided when ORS
8 requested SCE&G to provide all of the support calculations and documentation to
9 substantiate its calculations. Those differences substantially sidetracked and delayed our
10 analysis of the reasonableness of SCE&G's study. Other parties, not informed of the data
11 inconsistency, may have been similarly misdirected.

12 SCE&G's assertion that there are no avoided capacity costs for fifteen (15) years if
13 there are no winter capacity reductions, strikes me as a position that requires that the winter
14 capacity constraint be nearly indisputable. I do not believe that SCE&G has proven that
15 condition. They may be correct, but given the large shift in approach and shift in the way
16 one would think about capacity needs, I believe that SCE&G's position should not be
17 adopted in this Docket.

18 Q. **YOU MENTIONED THE DIFFICULTY IN EVALUATING SCE&G'S FILINGS,
19 BUT ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC ISSUES THAT YOU COULD IDENTIFY?**

20 A. Yes, I believe that SCE&G is overestimating the amount of excess capacity the
21 utility needs in the winter season because of a flawed 2017 Reserve Margin Study
22 ("Study"). I also believe the Company is forecasting summer and winter peak demands

1 for future years in an inconsistent manner that creates a potentially false indication of
2 higher capacity need for the winter season.

3 **Q. HOW IS SCE&G'S 2017 RESERVE MARGIN STUDY FLAWED?**

4 A. The study (Exhibit JML-2) starts with a very simplistic method of simply adding
5 together estimated peak variation from weather and variation in supply capacity to arrive
6 at "Total Reserve MWs". This is done separately for the summer and winter season and
7 divided by the summer and winter peak loads to arrive at the Reserve Margin Percentage
8 (Exhibit JML-2, p. 8). These calculations are shown in Table 4 of the study, reproduced
9 below.

10 *Table 1: Reproduction of Table-4, Exhibit JML-2, p. 8*

Reserve Margin for Summer and Winter Peak Periods		
	Summer	Winter
VACAR Operating	200	200
Demand-Side Risk	208	542
Supply-Side Risk	230	224
Total Reserve MWs	638	966
Normal Peak Demand	4744	4630
Reserve Margin %	13.4%	20.9%
Reserve Margin Policy	14%	21%

11
12 To my knowledge, this is not an industry standard approach (in contrast to the industry
13 standard approaches such as the Loss of Load Probability method presented by SCE&G in
14 its prior 2012 Reserve Margin Study).

15 Setting aside, however, the appropriateness of the method, the implementation of
16 the method is flawed because SCE&G's determination of the winter season peak demand
17 variation is overstated. By overstating the winter variability, SCE&G would be overstating
18 the need for reserve margin in the winter. Indeed, in looking at Table-4 reproduced above,

1 one sees that the variation in peak demand (called the “Demand-Side Risk” in the table)
 2 accounts for the entirety of the increase in the winter reserve margin over the summer
 3 reserve margin.

4 To emphasize this point, the table below shows the exact same reserve margin
 5 calculations, but replaces SCE&G’s estimate of winter demand-side risk with an estimate
 6 I produced using SCE&G’s data (once I was informed of the data inconsistency problem
 7 with their provided data). The table shows that with E3’s demand-risk, the amount of
 8 extra capacity required in the winter compared to summer is only 211 MW (849 MW – 638
 9 MW) --- not 328 MW as SCE&G claims.

10 *Table 2: Reserve Margin with Alternate Winter Peak Variation*

Reserve Margin for Summer and Winter Peak Periods		Difference	
	Summer	Winter	
VACAR Operating	200	200	
Demand-Side Risk	208	425	
Supply-Side Risk	230	224	
Total Reserve MWs	638	849	211
Normal Peak Demand	4744	4630	
Reserve Margin %	13.4%	18.3%	4.9%


11
 12 With this change, the winter reserve margin drops 2%, and the gap between the
 13 winter and summer reserve margins drops from 7% (21% - 14%) to about 5%.

14 **Q. WHY DO YOU BELIEVE THAT SCE&G HAS OVERSTATED THE WINTER
 15 VARIABILITY?**

16 **A.** SCE&G uses regression equations to estimate what peak demand would be on
 17 SCE&G’s system today given the weather that occurred on historical peak days since 1991.
 18 The lower figure on Exhibit JML-2, page 4, shows the estimated peak demands from the
 19 winter regression equation, with the points corresponding to the historical peak day


1 temperatures and corresponding simulated peak loads indicated by the black dots. The
2 figure is reproduced below. The x-axis is cooling degree hours. They represent the sum
3 of the differences between a design temperature, say 60 degrees, and the actual temperature
4 in each hour of the day. The colder the day, the higher the cooling degree hours.

5 *Figure 1: SCE&G Estimate of Winter Peak Demand using Historical Weather (Exhibit JML-2,
6 p. 4)*



7
8 Note the shape of the regression line. It slopes upward at an increasing rate, so that
9 it predicts that peak load will rise at an ever increasing rate as the days get colder. Contrast
10 that to the shape of SCE&G's predicted peak loads in the summer. In the summer figure,
11 reproduced below, the rate of increase declines as weather becomes more extreme. This is
12 indicated by the slight downward curve of the regression results.

1 *Figure 2: SCE&G Estimate of Summer Peak Demand using Historical Weather (Exhibit JML-2,*
2 *p. 4)*



3
4 The summer shape is what I would expect. As weather becomes more extreme, the
5 cooling equipment becomes more heavily used, but eventually top out and cannot increase
6 electricity usage any further. As individual units top out, one sees diminishing increases
7 in load as temperatures worsen.

8 In contrast, the winter shape has an upward curve, which is counter to engineering-
9 based expectations. This upward curve also exacerbates the variation in peak demand,
10 compared to the downward curve of the summer predictions. This can result in an overly
11 large estimate of winter variability for the winter season compared to the summer season.

12 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF SCE&G WINTER VARIABILITY?**


1 **A.** I estimate that SCE&G winter variability is 425 MW, as compared to SCE&G's
2 estimate of 542 MW. I estimated the variability using a corrected version of SCE&G's
3 regression data set. The most significant correction I made was to remove days that had
4 relative low temperatures. In the 27 years of historical winter peak data that SCE&G
5 provided, the lowest heating degree hour ("hdh") was 233. Hdh are the sum of the
6 difference between a day's hourly temperatures and a base temperature such as 60 degrees.
7 The colder the day, the larger the hdh. I, therefore, excluded all days with hdh at or below
8 200 from the dataset, as such moderate days would have little chance of being a peak winter
9 day. By doing this, the remaining data produced a regression model that gave a better
10 representation of peak electricity demand on winter peak days, and also revealed a more
11 logical linear relationship with hdh, rather than the quadratic relationship that SCE&G
12 obtained with the overly large dataset.

13 Put another way, SCE&G created a model to estimate daily peak load for any day
14 in the winter. The response of customers to changes in hdh at moderate levels is likely not
15 the same as their response at higher hdh levels. This is probably why the SCE&G model
16 has the curved shape. It is trying to fit two different response shapes. By reducing the data
17 set to exclude those moderate hdh days, my model specification is not affected by the
18 moderate days, and the curved shape is rejected for my data set --- which shows that the
19 curved response shape is not fundamental to customer response at high hdh levels.

20 The figure below shows the historical data that I used in my analysis, as well as the
21 predicted peak loads based on hdh. The round circles are the predicted peak loads for 2016,
22 at the peak day hdh observed over the last 27 years. The predicted peak would vary by

1 month, so I have assumed January peaks for the figure. Note that the January assumption
 2 does not affect the calculation of winter demand-side risk.

3 *Figure 3: E3 Modeled Winter Peak Demand using Historical Weather*



4
 5 SCE&G defined demand-side risk as the difference between the modeled maximum
 6 peak demand and average peak demand using the 27 years of peak hdh. The table below
 7 compares SCE&G's values used in their 2017 Reserve Margin study, and the results from
 8 my regression model. The lower deviation of 425 MW is the value used in my Reserve
 9 Margin calculation earlier in this testimony.

10 *Table 3: Winter Demand Side Risk*

MW Peak Demand - Winter				
	Maximum	Normal	Deviation	%Deviation
SCE&G JML-2, Table 1	5172	4630	542	11.7%
E3	5087	4662	425	9.1%

1

Table 4: E3 Regression Model Specifications

SUMMARY OUTPUT								
Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0.960166241							
R Square	0.921919211							
Adjusted R Square	0.891950135							
Standard Error	118.9069773							
Observations	56							
ANOVA								
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F			
Regression	7	8180115.389	1168587.913	96.42585561	4.61588E-26			
Residual	49	692804.5932	14138.86925					
Total	56	8872919.982						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	1747.325757	153.9953487	11.34661386	2.57753E-15	1437.860518	2056.790996	1437.860518	2056.790996
ihol	-647.1513228	123.0564432	-5.258979586	3.1645E-06	-894.4425039	-399.8601417	-894.4425039	-399.8601417
wkend	-436.1093908	35.3924265	-12.32211052	1.26743E-16	-507.2331347	-364.9856469	-507.2331347	-364.9856469
hdh	9.390656604	0.640992562	14.65018031	#NUM!	8.102533825	10.67877938	8.102533825	10.67877938
Jan	109.0530828	47.81469373	2.280744146	0.026949729	12.96585833	205.1403073	12.96585833	205.1403073
Feb	154.3791379	49.20292825	3.137600614	0.002881245	55.50215169	253.2561241	55.50215169	253.2561241
Nov	-141.8875	64.24746114	-2.208453027	0.031921619	-270.997607	-12.77739305	-270.997607	-12.77739305

2

3 **Q. IF YOUR LOWER WINTER RESERVE MARGIN VALUES WERE USED IN**
 4 **SCE&G'S IRP PROCESS, WOULD SUMMER CAPACITY NEEDS SURPASS**
 5 **WINTER CAPACITY NEEDS IN SOME YEARS AND THEREBY RESULT IN**
 6 **AVOIDED CAPACITY VALUE FOR SUMMER-FOCUSED RESOURCES LIKE**
 7 **SOLAR?**

8 **A.** Yes, but additional corrections should be applied to the load and resource balance
 9 table to properly reflect the difference in summer and winter capacity needs. The current
 10 table would suggest that six (6) in fifteen (15) years would benefit from summer capacity.
 11 That is to say, in six (6) of the fifteen (15) years the winter reserve percentage (line 15 in
 12 Exhibit JML-1) is more than 5% greater than the summer reserve percentage (I do not count
 13 years with baseload additions or seasonal capacity purchases). The 5% "rule" is based on
 14 the winter reserve margin requirement being 4.9% higher than the summer reserve margin

1 requirement. For example, if the winter reserve margin percentage in 2025 were 20%, and
2 the summer percentage was 18%, there is only a 2% difference, and winter capacity needs
3 would be binding over summer needs. Put another way, my winter reserve margin
4 threshold is 18.4% and my summer reserve margin threshold is 13.4%. At 20% in the
5 winter, there is 1.6% capacity above the threshold (20% - 18.4%). At 18% in the summer,
6 there is 4.6% capacity above the threshold (18% - 13.4%). Since 1.6% is smaller than
7 4.6%, winter is the constrained season.

8 *Table 5: Seasonal Reserve Margin Difference from Exhibit JML-1*

	Winter reserves in excess of summer reserves	Note
2018	6.0%	Baseload and Firm Purchase
2019	1.4%	Firm Purchase
2020	0.6%	Firm Purchase
2021	3.1%	Firm Purchase
2022	4.5%	Firm Purchase
2023	12.9%	Baseload added
2024	3.9%	
2025	4.3%	
2026	4.7%	
2027	5.0%	
2028	5.2%	
2029	5.4%	
2030	5.4%	
2031	7.2%	
2032	5.6%	

- 9
- 10 **Q. WHAT CHANGES ARE NEEDED FOR THE LOAD AND RESOURCE TABLE,**
11 **AND HOW WOULD THAT AFFECT THE VALUE OF SUMMER CAPACITY?**
- 12 **A.** In order to properly value summer and winter capacity, it is important to remove
13 any unintended bias between summer and winter values. Recall that SCE&G's method of

1 deriving the reserve margin threshold is to add up the extra capacity requirements from
 2 three components: 1) VACAR operating reserves, 2) demand-side risk, and 3) supply-side
 3 risk. The demand-side risk is the difference between the average annual peak and the
 4 maximum annual peak based on 27 recent years of data. It is therefore logical that the
 5 reserve margin threshold would be applied to forecasts of average annual peaks, since the
 6 risk of higher peaks is already embedded in the reserve margin threshold percentage.

7 The problem is that the load forecasts in the load and resource table (Exhibit JML-
 8 1) appear to be higher than any reasonable expectation of average peak, and moreover
 9 deviate more in the winter than the summer, which would be introducing a bias toward
 10 making winter the constrained capacity season. Table 6 shows that the gross territorial
 11 peak values in 2018 in the SCE&G load and resource table are higher than what normal
 12 loads should be given typical 1% per year growth rates since 2016. More importantly, the
 13 difference in MW is greater for winter than summer, which makes the winter appear
 14 relatively more capacity constrained than the summer.

15 *Table 6: Potential Bias of Seasonal Peak Demands in SCE&G 2018 IRP (MW)*

			Summer	Winter	Difference
1	Gross Territorial Peak from JML-1 for 2018		5077	5024	
2	Normal 2016 Peak from JML-2, table 1		4744	4630	
3	Assumed growth from 2016 to 2018		2%	2%	
4	Normal 2018 consistent with JML-2, table 1		4839	4723	
5	Difference (L1 - L4)		238	301	63

16
 17 While the 63 MW bias appears small, if we apply these corrections to the SCE&G
 18 load and resource table by subtracting the seasonal differences shown in line 5 of Table 6
 19 then summer becomes the constraining season in nine (9) of the fifteen (15) forecast years.
 20 That is a 50% increase from the six (6) out of fifteen (15) years when SCEG&E's

1 uncorrected load and resource table is used. This is shown in Table 7, which excludes
2 winter short term purchases and the 2023 addition of 540 MW of baseload capacity.

3 *Table 7: Seasonal Reserve Margin Difference with Correction to Average Peak*

	Winter reserves in excess of summer reserves	Note
2018	8.1%	Baseload added
2019	2.1%	
2020	1.9%	
2021	2.9%	
2022	3.4%	
2023	4.6%	
2024	5.5%	
2025	5.8%	
2026	6.2%	
2027	6.5%	
2028	6.6%	
2029	6.8%	
2030	6.8%	
2031	8.6%	
2032	7.0%	

4

5 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOUR CHANGES ABOVE PROVIDE AN ACCURATE**
6 **REPRESENTATION OF THE VALUE OF SOLAR CAPACITY?**

7 **A.** While I believe that my changes provide a better indication of the value of solar
8 capacity, I suspect that there are other changes that should also be applied. While the
9 corrections that I present are relatively small individually, their impact on the relationship
10 between winter and summer capacity need highlights the sensitive nature of this problem.
11 Essentially a new dimension has been added into the evaluation of peak capacity and
12 avoided capacity costs. Because of the effect of solar on summer versus winter peaks, the

1 difference in summer versus winter capacity needs becomes critical to evaluate solar, and
2 I believe it has not received sufficient exploration in this Docket.

3 **Q. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SCE&G's AVOIDED CAPACITY COSTS
4 APPROPRIATE?**

5 **A.** No. SCE&G bases its assertion of zero avoided capacity cost for solar projects on
6 SCE&G being constrained by winter capacity needs, and unaided by summer capacity
7 reductions. This is a substantial change from the methodology and inputs used by SCE&G
8 to calculate prior PR-1 and PR-2 rates, and relies upon assumptions and studies conducted
9 in the 2018 IRP that have not been fully reviewed, vetted and/or approved by the
10 Commission. Given the large change in SCE&G's position, and the uncertainty over the
11 accuracy of its new position, I recommend that SCE&G's position of zero avoided capacity
12 costs be rejected at this time.

13 **Q. GIVEN THE PROBLEMS WITH SCE&G'S ANALYSIS, WHAT DO YOU
14 RECOMMEND THE COMMISSION ADOPT FOR PR-2 CAPACITY VALUE?**

15 **A.** I recommend that the PR-2 capacity value be set at 19.5% of the avoided cost of
16 per kW from a 100 MW change to SCE&G's base resource plan that excludes any non-
17 committed future resources and reflects any planned plant retirements of firm capacity.
18 Including 19.5% of the avoided capacity value is based on SCE&G's solar analysis that
19 found that a 100 MW increment of new solar would reduce summer peak demand by about
20 19.5 MW (Exhibit JML-4, p. 6). For example, in Docket No. 2016-2-E, SCE&G estimated
21 the long run avoided capacity cost for a 100 MW change to be \$21.34/kW-yr (Lynch direct
22 testimony, p. 15). Applying the 19.5% factor would have resulted in an avoided capacity
23 cost for solar of \$4.16/kW-yr.

1 Unfortunately, SCE&G has not provided a long-run avoided capacity cost in this
2 Docket. ORS attempted to acquire a capacity cost estimate from SCE&G, but SCE&G
3 declined.

4 Because of the time constraints and the lack of an avoided capacity cost calculation
5 by SCE&G in this Docket, I was unable to produce an independent estimate of avoided
6 capacity costs for a 100 MW change in supply. I recommend that SCE&G be required to
7 provide an estimate of long-run avoided capacity cost and the calculation for the long-run
8 avoided capacity costs. In addition, ORS and other parties should be allowed to review
9 and provide comment to the Commission based on SCE&G's estimate and calculation.
10 Alternatively, I recommend that the current capacity value be maintained for both PR-1
11 and PR-2 until a better capacity value can be provided in the next rate update.

12 **Q. DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION ON SCE&G'S POSITION OF NOT PROVIDING A
13 STANDARD RATE OFFER FOR NON-SOLAR RESOURCES?**

14 A. Yes. Despite the lack of update of the PR-2 rate by non-solar resources, I believe
15 that SCE&G should continue to provide a standard published rate for such resources. The
16 lack of a published rate would increase the uncertainty and engagement costs for new
17 resources. The need to commence a negotiation on compensation terms would increase
18 project lead times and costs for the developers, which could be a significant barrier for such
19 small projects.

20 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE CHANGES TO SCE&G'S FILED TOTAL VALUE OF NEM
21 DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES.**

22 A. As required by Commission Order No. 2015-194, SCE&G must calculate 11
23 components of value for NEM Distributed Energy Resources ("DERs"). In Docket No.

1 2017-2-E, SCE&G calculated these 11 components of value; in Order No. 2017-246, the
 2 Commission determined the values SCE&G calculated complied with the NEM
 3 Methodology as approved by the Commission in Order No. 2015-194. On page 27 of
 4 witness Lynch's direct testimony, SCE&G reports the updated values for these same 11
 5 components. Table 8 below summarizes the values as approved in Order No. 2017-246 and
 6 as filed in the current Docket. The significant changes are in the Avoided Energy Costs
 7 and Avoided Capacity Costs line items.

8 *Table 8. Value of NEM Distributed Energy Resources (\$/kWh): 2017 Approved and 2018 Filed*
 9 *(Lynch pp. 26,27)*

	Order No. 2017-246: IRP Planning Horizon (15-yr Levelized)	Docket No. 2018-2-E IRP Planning Horizon (15-yr Levelized)	Components
1	\$0.03199	\$0.03014	Avoided Energy Costs
2	\$0.00172	\$0	Avoided Capacity Costs
3	\$0	\$0	Ancillary Services
4	\$0	\$0	T&D Capacity
5	\$0.00004	\$0.00004	Avoided Criteria Pollutants
6	\$0	\$0	Avoided CO ₂ Emission Cost
7	\$0	\$0	Fuel Hedge
8	\$0	\$0	Utility Integration & Interconnection Costs
9	\$0	\$0	Utility Administration Costs
10	\$0	\$0	Environmental Costs
11	\$0.03375	\$0.03018	Subtotal
12	\$0.00276	\$0.00246	Line Losses @ 0.9245
13	\$0.03651	\$0.03264	Total Value of NEM Distributed Energy Resources

1 **Q. WHAT CAUSED THE DIFFERENCES IN AVOIDED ENERGY AND AVOIDED**
2 **CAPACITY COSTS FOR NEM DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES?**

3 **A.** As described in witness Lynch's Direct Testimony, SCE&G bases its NEM DERs
4 avoided energy and avoided capacity costs on the PURPA avoided cost values. The
5 avoided energy costs are adjusted to remove criteria pollutants, which are accounted for
6 separately in the "Avoided Criteria Pollutants" line item. The PURPA avoided energy cost
7 decreased from last year, leading to a reduction in the NEM DERs avoided energy cost.
8 Similarly, this year SCE&G claimed zero value for PURPA avoided capacity cost, which
9 led to a zero value for the corresponding NEM DERs avoided capacity cost.

10 **Q. ARE SCE&G's REASONS FOR WHY IT HAS ZERO VALUE FOR 7 OF THE**
11 **OTHER COMPONENTS OF THE NEM DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES**
12 **TOTAL VALUE STACK REASONABLE?**

13 **A.** Yes. SCE&G is following the methodology approved by the Commission in Order
14 No. 2015-194 in evaluating the value of each component of the NEM DERs Total Value
15 stack. Regarding T&D Capacity, it should be noted that some jurisdictions recognize the
16 value NEM resources can provide in deferring T&D investments and therefore attribute
17 capacity value to resources like solar. SCE&G's practice of designing transmission and
18 distribution circuits to assume DER is not generating due to weather factors or because
19 DER resources are off line does follow the Commission approved methodology, but it is a
20 conservative approach. Regarding avoided CO₂ emissions, while some jurisdictions
21 recognize value in avoided CO₂ Emissions, Commission Order No. 2015-194 directs
22 SCE&G to use zero monetary value for CO₂ "until state or federal laws or regulations result

1 in an avoidable cost on Utility systems for these emissions.” (PSC Order No. 2015-194, p.
2 9)

3 **Q. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SCE&G's VALUE OF NEM DISTRIBUTED ENERGY
4 RESOURCES COSTS APPROPRIATE?**

5 **A.** Excepting the Avoided Capacity Cost component, the filed SCE&G Value of NEM
6 Distributed Energy Resources components are conservative, but appropriate. The Avoided
7 Capacity Cost component is based on the PURPA Avoided Capacity Cost values, and I
8 have previously discussed why I find the filed PURPA Avoided Capacity Cost values
9 inappropriate. Should the Commission reject the Company’s proposed Avoided Capacity
10 Cost values, the Total Value of NEM Distributed Energy Resources would be impacted.

11 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

12 **A.** Yes.

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

Brian Horii

101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94104
brian@ethree.com

415.391.5100

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS, INC.

Senior Partner

San Francisco, CA

1993 – Present

Mr. Horii is one of the founding partners of Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. (E3). He is a lead in the practice areas of Resource Planning; Energy Efficiency and Demand Response; Cost of Service and Rate Design; and acts as a lead in quantitative methods for the firm. Mr. Horii also works in the Energy and Climate Policy, Distributed Resources and regulatory support practice areas. He has testified and prepared expert testimony for use in regulatory proceedings in California, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, British Columbia, and Ontario Canada. He designed and implemented numerous computer models used in regulatory proceedings, litigation, utility planning, utility requests for resource additions, and utility operations. His clients include BC Hydro, California Energy Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, Consolidated Edison, El Paso Electric Company, Hawaiian Electric Company, Hydro Quebec, Minnesota Department of Commerce, NYSERDA, Orange and Rockland, PG&E, Sempra, Southern California Edison, South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff.

Resource Planning:

- Authored the Locational Net Benefits Analysis tool used by the California IOUs to evaluate the total system and local benefit of distributed energy resources by detailed distribution subareas.
- Created the software used by BC Hydro to evaluate individual bids and portfolios tendered in calls for supplying power to Vancouver Island; demand response from large customers; and new clean power generation.
- Designed the hourly generation dispatch and spinning reserve model used by El Paso Electric to simulate plant operations and determine value-sharing payments.
- Evaluated the sale value of hydroelectric assets in the Western United States.
- Simulated bilateral trading decisions in an open access market; analyzed market segments for micro generation options under unbundled rate scenarios; forecasted stranded asset risk and recovery for North American utilities; and created unbundled rate forecasts.
- Reviewed and revised local area load forecasting methods for PG&E, Puget Sound Energy, and Orange and Rockland Utilities

Energy Efficiency, Demand Response, and Distributed Resources:

- Principal investigator for the CEC EPIC project on valuing distributed energy resources on a local area basis with an emphasis on solar plus storage.
- Author of the “E3 Calculator” tool used as the basis for all energy efficiency programs evaluations in California since 2006.
- Independent evaluator for the development of locational avoided costs by the Minnesota electric utilities.
- Co-author of the NYSERDA Solar Value Stack Calculator to help contractors better estimate compensation for specific solar projects.

E3: Brian Horii Resume

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

- Consulted on the development of the NEM 2.0 Calculator for the CPUC Energy Division that was used by stakeholders in the proceeding as the common analytical framework for party positions. Also, authored the model's sections on revenue allocation that forecast customer class rate changes over time, subject to changes in class service costs.
- Coauthor of the avoided cost methodology adopted by the California CPUC for use in distributed energy resource programs since 2005.
- Principal consultant for the California Energy Commission's Title-24 building standards to reflect how the time and area specific value of energy usage reductions and customer-sited photovoltaics and storage.
- Principal investigator for the 1992 EPRI report, Targeting DSM for Transmission and Distribution Benefits: A Case Study of PG&E's Delta District, one of the first reports to focus on demand-side alternatives to traditional wires expansion projects.
- Provided testimony to the CPUC on the demand response cost effectiveness framework on behalf of a thermal energy storage corporation.

Cost of Service and Rate Design:

- Designed standard and innovative electric utility rate options for utilities the United States, Canada, and the Middle East.
- Principal author of the Full Value Tariff and Retail Rate Choices report for NYSERDA and the New York Department of Public Staff as part of the New York REV proceeding.
- Developed the rate design models used by BC Hydro and the BCUC for rate design proceedings in 2008, 2010, and ongoing.
- Principal author on marginal costing, ratemaking trends and rate forecasting for the California Energy Commission's investigation into the revision of building performance standards to effect improvements in resource consumption and investment decisions.
- Consulted to the New York State Public Service Commission on the appropriate marginal cost methodologies (including consideration of environmental and customer value of service) and the appropriate cost tests.
- Authored testimony for BC Hydro on Bulk Transmission Incremental Costs (1997). Principal author of B.C. Hydro's System Incremental Cost Study 1994 Update (With Regional Results Appendix).
- Performed detailed market segmentation study for Ontario Hydro under both embedded and marginal costs.
- Testified for the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff on SCANA marginal costs.
- Taught courses on customer profitability analysis for the Electric Power Research Institute
- Other work in the area includes marginal cost-based revenue allocation and rate design, estimation of area and time specific marginal costs; incorporation of customer outage costs into planning criteria designing a comprehensive billing and information management system for a major ESP operating in California.

Transmission Planning and Pricing:

- Designed a hydroelectric water management and renewable integration model used to evaluate the need for transmission expansion in the California central valley.
- Developed the quantitative modeling of the net benefits to the California grid of SDG&E's Sunrise Powerlink project. The work was performed in support of the CAISO's testimonies in that proceeding.

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

- Testified on behalf of the Vermont Department of Public Service on the need for transmission capacity expansion by VELCO.
- Determined the impact of net vs. gross billing for transmission services on transmission congestion in Ontario and the revenue impact for Ontario Power Generation.
- Authored numerous Local Integrated Resource Planning studies for North American utilities that examine the cost effectiveness of distributed resource alternatives to traditional transmission and distribution expansions and upgrades.
- Developed the cost basis for BC Hydro's wholesale transmission tariffs.
- Provided support to utility regulatory filings, including testimony writing and other litigation services.

Energy and Climate Policy:

- Author of the E3 "GHG Calculator" tool used by the CPUC and California Energy Commission for evaluation of electricity sector greenhouse gas emissions and tradeoffs.
- Primary architect of long term planning models evaluating the cost and efficiency of carbon reduction strategies and technologies
- Testified before the British Columbia Public Utilities Commission on electric market restructuring.

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

Project Manager, Supervisor of Electric Rates

San Francisco, CA

1987-1993

- Managed and provided technical support to PG&E's investigation into the Distributed Utilities (DU) concept. The projects included an assessment of the potential for DU devices at PG&E, an analysis of the loading patterns on PG&E's 3000 feeders, and formulation of the modeling issues surrounding the integration of Generation, Transmission, and Distribution planning models.
- Served as PG&E's expert witness on revenue allocation and rate design in testimonies before the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Was instrumental in getting PG&E's area-specific loads and costs adopted by the CPUC, and extending their application to cost effectiveness analyses of DSM programs. Additional analytical work included creating interactive negotiation analysis programs, and forecasting electric rates trends for short-term planning.

INDEPENDENT CONSULTING

Consultant

San Francisco, CA

1989-1993

- Helped developed methodology for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of decentralized generation systems for relieving local distribution constraints, and created a model for determining the least cost expansion of local transmission and distribution facilities integrated with area-specific DSM incentive programs.
- Co-authored The Delta Report for PG&E and EPRI which examined the targeting of DSM measures to defer the expansion of local distribution facilities.

Education

Stanford University

Palo Alto, CA

E3: Brian Horii Resume

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

<i>M.S., Civil Engineering and Environmental Planning</i>	1987
<i>Stanford University</i>	<i>Palo Alto, CA</i>
<i>B.S., Civil Engineering</i>	<i>1986</i>
<u>Citizenship</u>	
<i>United States</i>	

Refereed Papers

1. *Woo, C.K., I. Horowitz, B. Horii, R. Orans, and J. Zarnikau (2012) "Blowing in the wind: Vanishing payoffs of a tolling agreement for natural-gas-fired generation of electricity in Texas," The Energy Journal, 33:1, 207-229.*
2. *Orans, R., C.K. Woo, B. Horii, M. Chait and A. DeBenedictis (2010) "Electricity Pricing for Conservation and Load Shifting," Electricity Journal, 23:3, 7-14.*
3. *Moore, J., C.K. Woo, B. Horii, S. Price and A. Olson (2010) "Estimating the Option Value of a Non-firm Electricity Tariff," Energy, 35, 1609-1614.*
4. *Woo, C.K., B. Horii, M. Chait and I. Horowitz (2008) "Should a Lower Discount Rate be Used for Evaluating a Tolling Agreement than Used for a Renewable Energy Contract?" Electricity Journal, 21:9, 35-40.*
5. *Woo, C.K., E. Kollman, R. Orans, S. Price and B. Horii (2008) "Now that California Has AMI, What Can the State Do with It?" Energy Policy, 36, 1366-74.*
6. *Baskette, C., B. Horii, E Kollman, and S. Price (2006) "Avoided cost estimation and post reform funding allocation for California's energy efficiency programs," Energy 31, (2006) 1084-1099.*
7. *Woo, C.K., I. Horowitz, A. Olson, B. Horii and C. Baskette (2006) "Efficient Frontiers for Electricity Procurement by an LDC with Multiple Purchase Options," OMEGA, 34:1, 70-80.*
8. *Woo, C.K., I. Horowitz, B. Horii and R. Karimov (2004) "The Efficient Frontier for Spot and Forward Purchases: An Application to Electricity," Journal of the Operational Research Society, 55, 1130-1136.*
9. *Woo, C. K., B. Horii and I. Horowitz (2002) "The Hopkinson Tariff Alternative to TOU Rates in the Israel Electric Corporation," Managerial and Decision Economics, 23:9-19.*
10. *Heffner, G., C.K. Woo, B. Horii and D. Lloyd-Zannetti (1998) "Variations in Area- and Time-Specific Marginal Capacity Costs of Electricity Distribution," IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, PE-493-PWRS-012-1997, 13:2, 560-567.*
11. *Chow, R.F., Horii, B., Orans, R. et. al. (1995), Local Integrated Resource Planning of a Large Load Supply System, Canadian Electrical Association.*

E3: Brian Horii Resume

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

12. *Woo, C.K., R. Orans, B. Horii and P. Chow* (1995) "Pareto-Superior Time-of-Use Rate Option for Industrial Firms," *Economics Letters*, 49, 267-272.
13. *Pupp, R., C.K.Woo, R. Orans, B. Horii, and G. Heffner* (1995), "Load Research and Integrated Local T&D Planning," *Energy - The International Journal*, 20:2, 89-94.
14. *Woo, C.K., D. Lloyd-Zannetti, R. Orans, B. Horii and G. Heffner* (1995) "Marginal Capacity Costs of Electricity Distribution and Demand for Distributed Generation," *The Energy Journal*, 16:2, 111-130.
15. *Woo, C.K., R. Orans, B. Horii, R. Pupp and G. Heffner* (1994), "Area- and Time-Specific Marginal Capacity Costs of Electricity Distribution," *Energy - The International Journal*, 19:12, 1213-1218.
16. *Woo, C.K., B. Hobbs, Orans, R. Pupp and B. Horii* (1994), "Emission Costs, Customer Bypass and Efficient Pricing of Electricity," *Energy Journal*, 15:3, 43-54.
17. *Orans, R., C.K. Woo and B. Horii* (1994), "Targeting Demand Side Management for Electricity Transmission and Distribution Benefits," *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 15, 169-175.

Research Reports and Filed Testimony

1. *Horii B., C.K. Woo, E. Kollman and M. Chait* (2009) *Smart Meter Implementation Business Case, Rate-related Capacity Conservation Estimates - Technical Appendices* submitted to B.C. Hydro.
2. *Horii, B., P. Auclair, E. Cutter, and J. Moore* (2006) *Local Integrated Resource Planning Study: PG&E's Windsor Area*, Report prepared for PG&E.
3. *Horii, B., R. Orans, A. Olsen, S. Price and J Hirsch* (2006) *Report on 2006 Update to Avoided Costs and E3 Calculator*, Prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission.
4. *Horii, B., (2005) Joint Utility Report Summarizing Workshops on Avoided Costs Inputs and the E3 Calculator*, Primary author of testimony filed before the California Public Utilities Commission.
5. *Horii, B., R. Orans, and E. Cutter* (2005) *HELCO Residential Rate Design Investigation*, Report prepared for Hawaiian Electric and Light Company.
6. *Orans, R., C.K. Woo, and B. Horii* (2004-2005) *PG&E Generation Marginal Costs, Direct and rebuttal testimonies* submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of PG&E.
7. *Orans, R., C.K. Woo, B. Horii, S. Price, A. Olson, C. Baskette, and J Swisher* (2004) *Methodology and Forecast of Long Term Avoided Costs for the Evaluation of California Energy Efficiency Programs*, Report prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission.
8. *Orans, R, B. Horii, A. Olson, M. Kin,* (2004) *Electric Reliability Primer*, Report prepared for B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.
9. *Horii, B., T. Chu* (2004) *Long-Run Incremental Cost Update – 2006/2005*, Report prepared for B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.

E3: Brian Horii Resume

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

10. Price, S., B. Horii (2001) *Chelsea and E. 13th Street / East River Evaluation, Local integrated resource planning study prepared for Consolidated Edison Company of New York.*
11. Horii, B., C.K. Woo, and S. Price (2001) *Local Integrated Resource Planning Study for the North of San Mateo Study Area, Report prepared for PG&E.*
12. Horii, B., C.K. Woo and D. Engel (2000) *PY2001 Public Purpose Program Strategy and Filing Assistance: (a) A New Methodology for Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation; (b) Peak Benefit Evaluation; (c) Screening Methodology for Customer Energy Management Programs; and (d) Should California Ratepayers Fund Programs that Promote Consumer Purchases of Cost-Effective Energy Efficient Goods and Services? Reports submitted to Pacific Gas and Electric Company.*
13. Horii, B. (2000) *Small Area Forecasting Process and Documentation, Report prepared for Puget Sound Energy Company.*
14. Price S., B. Horii, and K. Knapp (2000) *Rainey to East 75th Project – Distributed Resource Screening Study, Report prepared for Consolidated Edison Company of New York.*
15. Mahone, D., J. McHugh, B. Horii, S. Price, C. Eley, and B. Wilcox (1999) *Dollar-Based Performance Standards for Building Energy Efficiency, Report submitted to PG&E for the California Energy Commission.*
16. Horii, B., J. Martin (1999) *Report to the Alaska Legislature on Restructuring, E3 prepared the forecasts of market prices and stakeholder impacts used in this CH2M Hill report.*
17. Horii, B., S. Price, G. Ball, R. Dugan (1999) *Local Integrated Resource Planning Study for PG&E's Tri-Valley Area, Report prepared for PG&E.*
18. Woo, C.K. and B. Horii (1999) *Should Israel Electric Corporation (IEC) Replace Its Industrial Time of Use Energy Rates with A Hopkinson Tariff? Report prepared for IEC.*
19. B. Horii, J. Martin, Khoa Hoang, (1996), *Capacity Costing Spreadsheet: Application of Incremental Costs to Local Investment Plans, Report and software forthcoming from the Electric Power Research Institute.*
20. Lloyd-Zanetti, D., B. Horii, J. Martin, S. Price, and C.K. Woo (1996), *Profitability Primer: A Guide to Profitability Analysis in the Electric Power Industry, Report No. TR-106569, Electric Power Research Institute.*
21. Horii B., (1996) *Customer Reclassification Study, Report Submitted to Ontario Hydro.*
22. Horii, B., Orans, R., Woo, C.K., (1995) *Area- and Time- Specific Marginal Cost and Targeted DSM Study, Report submitted to PSI Energy.*
23. Horii, B., Orans, R., Woo, C.K., (1995) *Local Integrated Resource Planning Study - White Rock, Report submitted to B.C. Hydro.*

E3: Brian Horii Resume

**Office of Regulatory Staff
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
Docket No. 2018-2-E**

EXHIBIT BHK-1

24. Horii, B., Orans, R., Woo, C.K., (1995) *Area- and Time- Specific Marginal Cost Study, Report submitted to B.C. Hydro.*
25. Orans, R., C.K. Woo and B. Horii (1995), *Impact of Market Structure and Pricing Options on Customers' Bills, Report submitted to B.C. Hydro.*
26. Horii, B., R. Orans (1995), *System Incremental Cost Study 1994 Update (With Regional Results Appendix), Report submitted to B.C. Hydro.*
27. Horii, B., Orans, R., Woo, C.K., (1994) *Marginal Cost Disaggregation Study, Report submitted to PSI Energy.*
28. Orans, R., C.K. Woo, J.N. Swisher, B. Wiersma and B. Horii (1992), *Targeting DSM for Transmission and Distribution Benefits: A Case Study of PG&E's Delta District, Report No. TR-100487, Electric Power Research Institute.*
29. Horii, B., (1991) *Pacific Gas and Electric Company 1993 General Rate Case Application (eight exhibits within Phase I, and contributions to five exhibits within Phase II), A. 91-11-036, Submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission.*
30. Horii, B., (1991) *Pacific Gas and Electric Company 1991 Electricity Cost Adjustment Clause Application (Revenue Allocation and Rate Design), Submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission.*

Conference Papers

1. Heffner, G., C.K. Woo, B. Horii and D. Lloyd-Zannetti (1998) "Variations in Area- and Time-Specific Marginal Capacity Costs of Electricity Distribution," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, PE-493-PWRS-012-1997, 13:2, 560-567.*
2. Horii, B., (1995), "Final Results for the NMPC Area Costing and Distributed Resource Study," *Proceedings Distributed Resources 1995: EPRI's First Annual Distributed Resources Conference, Electric Research Power Institute, August 29-31, 1995, Kansas City, Missouri*
3. Orans, R., C.K. Woo, B. Horii and R. Pupp, (1994), "Estimation and Applications of Area- and Time-Specific Marginal Capacity Costs," *Proceedings: 1994 Innovative Electricity Pricing, (February 9-11, Tampa, Florida) Electric Research Power Institute, Report TR-103629, 306-315.*
4. Heffner, G., R. Orans, C.K. Woo, B. Horii and R. Pupp (1993), "Estimating Area Load and DSM Impact by Customer Class and End-Use," *Western Load Research Association Conference, September 22-24, San Diego, California; and Electric Power Research Institute CEED Conference, October 27-29, St. Louis, Missouri.*